

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated February 9, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 9, 2007.

After entry of this response, claims 18-21, 23, and 26-33 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-17, 22, 24, 25, and 34 have been canceled. Claims 18 and 23 are amended to clarify the invention. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by the amendments. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim because claims 14 and 15 are improperly dependents on canceled claim 13. Claims 14 and 15 have been canceled, thereby obviating this rejection. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

### ***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-12, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pia et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,890,540, hereinafter, "*Pia*") in view of *Angle* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,431,270). Claims 7, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pia* in view of *Angle* and further in view of *Geaghan et al.* (U.S. Pub. 2003/0063073, hereinafter, "*Geagan*"). Applicants have canceled claims 1-17, thereby obviating these rejections. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

Claims 18-26 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pia* in view of *Schwendemann et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,636,934, hereinafter, "*Schwendemann*") and *Angle*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one with ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

The combination of *Pia* in view of *Schwendemann* and *Angle* fails to establish at least the third criterion for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. For example, *Pia* in view of *Schwendemann* and *Angle* does not teach, show, or suggest “displaying an image representing the rotation of the actuating member on the touch screen, wherein the image comprises an indicator bar” as recited in amended independent claim 18. Rather, the cited portion of *Angle* only teaches that images of the wellbore interior on a display may be rotated and manipulated by a user or operator (col. 14, lines 34-42). Furthermore, the cited portions of *Angle*—as well as the remainder of the reference, *Pia*, and *Schwendemann*—are silent as to an indicator bar.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 18, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pia* in view of *Angle* and further in view of *Zimmerman* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,109,357). *Zimmerman* fails to overcome the deficiencies in *Pia* in view of *Schwendemann* and *Angle*. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 27-32, in view of the allowable independent claim 18, are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

### **Conclusion**

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.4,**

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read

Registration No. 43,876

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants